DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 041 SP 038 323

TITLE	Collaboration on the Teacher Education Scene: An Academic Year in the Classroom. Symposium.
PUB DATE	1998-11-06
NOTE	61p.; Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 3-6, 1998).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Program Evaluation; Student Teaching; *Teacher Collaboration; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	University of Tennessee Chattanooga

ABSTRACT

This symposium addresses the historical development of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) Professional Development School (PDS) in collaboration with the Hamilton County Public Schools. The study goes from PDS I, a semester-long initial field experience, to a major component of the teacher preparation program with the addition of PDS II, a semester-long student teaching placement at two different PDS sites. Four papers chronicle the establishment, development, and expansion of the program. The papers are: (1) "The Vision: Establishment and Development of the PDS Program" (Thomas Bibler, Mary Tanner, and Sandra Black); (2) "The Action: Procedures, Outcomes and Futures" (Kathleen Puckett, Doug Kingdon, Karla Riddle, and Barbara Wofford); (3) "The Outgrowth: Expansion of the PDS Program" (Barbara Ray, Valerie Rutledge, and Jeanette Stepanske); and (4) "The Evaluation: A Connection to the Tennessee Framework for Teachers" (Cynthia Gettys, Daniel Baker, and Caryl Taylor). An appendix contains observation and evaluation forms. (Contains 33 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 041

COLLABORATION ON THE TEACHER EDUCATION SCENE: AN ACADEMIC YEAR IN THE CLASSROOM

Symposium Organizer:
Cynthia M. Gettys
Cynthia-Gettys@utc.edu
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403-2598

Individual Papers:

The Vision: Establishment & Development of the PDS Program
Thomas Bibler, Head of Teacher Preparation Academy
Mary Tanner, Dean of College of Education and Applied Professional Studies
Sandra Black, Associate Superintendent Hamilton County Public Schools

The Action: Procedures, Outcomes and Futures
Kathleen Puckett, Special Education Professor at PDS
Doug Kingdon, Elementary Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence
Karla Riddle, PDS Site Coordinator, Hamilton County Public Schools
Barbara Wofford, Elementary Education Professor at PDS

The Outgrowth: Expansion of the PDS Program
Barbara Ray, Special Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence
Valerie Rutledge, Secondary English Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence
Jeanette Stepanske, Elementary Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence

The Evaluation: A Connection to the Tennessee Framework for Teachers
Cynthia Gettys, Elementary Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence
Daniel Baker, Secondary Education, Professor-In-Residence
Caryl Taylor, Special Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence

presented at the

Mid-South Educational Research Association Conference

New Orleans, Louisiana

November 6, 1998

SP038323

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gettys, Cynthia

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Overview

In September, 1996 the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) published its report entitled What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future. Citing the preparation and continuing professional development of excellent teachers as one of the surest ways to guarantee the quality of children's educational experiences, the report stressed the establishment of higher education/K-12 partnerships. UTC has responded to this challenge by creating professional development schools that were jointly selected and established by a collaborative effort between the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) and the Hamilton County Public Schools (HCPS).

One trend in teacher education is the emergence of the Professional Development Schools (PDS), a program which combines theory and practice in real-life experiences for prospective teachers. Such schools, analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, involve practicing teachers in preparing and training future teachers. Since both public schools systems and colleges of education have significant interest in preparing new teachers, PDS's serve as centers for preparation and research.

Another trend in teacher preparation is in response to the growing inclusive education movement, where special needs students are educated as much as possible in a general education environment with support from special education teachers. This particular delivery model calls into question the separate methods courses typical of teacher training and encourages a closer look at collaborative practices in methods courses for pre-service general and special education teachers. UTC's PDS's have separately and jointly addressed both of these current trends in teacher preparation programs.

Statement of the Problem

As a teacher training institution, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga and Hamilton County Public Schools, the number one employer of UTC student teachers are jointly concerned

with preparation of teachers who excel in the teaching profession, are prepared for current and new challenges of the 21st century, and will continue in the profession as classroom teachers for more than the national average, an initial one or two years, before dropping out. This current study addresses the historical development of the UTC PDS in collaboration with the HCPS, from PDS I, a semester long initial field experience, to a major component of the teacher preparation program with the addition of PDS II, a semester long student teaching placement at two different PDS sites. This development has resulted in one full academic year in the classroom prior to graduation and teacher licensure for our graduates.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to UTC's initial two PDS I sites, and the six new PDS II (student teaching) sites that have been collaboratively developed by UTC and HCPS and generalizations cannot be made to any other PDS program at another university. Two previous papers have been written analysising the initial perceptions of the PDS experience from the perspectives of the students, site-coordinators, principals, and university professors and chronicling the beginning of a longitudinal study. (Gettys, & Ray, 1996, and Gettys, Puckett, Rutledge, Kingdon, Ray, Stepanske, Taylor & Wofford, 1997).

Purpose of the Study

The initial purpose of this study was to reflectively chronicle the establishment, emergence, expansion, and collaboration between two institutions, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga and the Hamilton County Public Schools, to produce better beginning teachers for the children of Hamilton County and southeastern Tennessee through their involvement in the Professional Development Schools experience. Thus the title, Collaboration on the Teacher Education Scene: An Academic Year in the Classroom.

During the development of the PDSs at UTC the literature was very carefully searched and a listing of references is included with these papers. Representatives from the UTC university faculty recently participated in the 1st National Professional Development Conference jointly sponsored by Towson University and the Maryland State Department of Education.

Historical Overview of UTC's PDS Program

Since the fall semester, 1995, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga has implemented the PDS as a semester-long experience. Students enroll as a cohort and become an extension of the faculty at the school to which they are assigned. Rather than spending hours in a college classroom discussing theoretical ideas of education, students learn methods and strategies of teaching along with specific ideas for classroom management and immediately move into a classroom of real students to put these concepts into practice.

As UTC's Professional Development Schools have evolved, they have expanded from serving only elementary majors in 1995 to include secondary and special education majors in 1997. Beginning with the spring semester of 1998 a new cohort was added to this continuing evolving group. Student teachers were assigned to a PDS II configuration and moved as cohorts from school to school during the course of their student teaching semester. This mixture of students enables the faculty of the university to adapt their courses and present them in an integrated format which more closely resembles the educational setting in which students will be employed after graduation. Besides enabling the college students to gain a broader perspective of the education profession, they also learned about the interdisciplinary nature of their fields and the need to understand how it relates to a wide range of subjects, grades, and settings.

PDS semesters provide other intangible benefits. Graduates of this experience have developed a network of contacts with teachers and administrators in whose schools they have worked. They have been a part of the everyday activities of the school and have seen for themselves the myriad requirements and expectations facing the faculty of a school. In addition, they have learned about the day-to-day responsibilities, which demand much of the teacher's time but are not directly related to classroom instruction. Our research demonstrates that these students with expanded classroom experience were sought by administrators to fill openings for the 1998-1999 academic year.

This symposium will chronicle the establishment, development, and expansion of this program through the presentation of papers outlining the program overview, processes involved

in developing collaborative teams. and forms to replicate the collaboration between the university and the public school system.

The Vision: Establishment & Development of the PDS Program

Thomas Bibler
Head of Teacher Preparation Academy
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Mary Tanner
Dean of College of Education and Applied Professional Studies
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Sandra Black
Associate Superintendent
Hamilton County Public Schools

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) has long enjoyed a good reputation as a traditional teacher preparation program. It featured a minimal amount of field experience beginning in the sophomore year, followed by some course specific field work in the junior year and culminated in a full semester of student teaching in the senior year which occurred in two eight week blocks in two different types of schools at two different grade levels. Each student teacher had one K-12 cooperating teacher each eight weeks to serve as their mentor. The supervision and ultimate evaluation was done by a college appointed supervisor who usually was an adjunct faculty member and who saw the student teacher three to four times per placement.

In discussing UTC's teacher preparation program with UTC's education students and with administrators and teachers from the Hamilton County School System, one of the largest employers of UTC education graduates, several areas of concern surfaced:

1) Too many beginning teachers were leaving the profession in the first and second years of certification.

2) There seemed to be a disconnect between the course work at UTC and the student teaching experience -- UTC faculty was responsible for the course work and then the student teacher was turned over to the Director of Student Teaching and adjunct supervisors and graduated without further in-put from the faculty.

3) The gap between theory and practice in college education courses seemed unreasonably large and students were left to bridge this gap on their own.

4) There was an apparent redundancy in many college education courses.

5) Middle school teachers appeared to be deficient in their content knowledge.

To meet some of these concerns faculty decided to examine and modify the early field experiences. Two county schools, one K-12 and one K-5, were selected and the program discussed with their principals and faculty. Each school agreed to provide an on-site coordinator from among their faculty. Each agreed to take a cohort of up to twenty-five UTC sophomores/juniors/post baccalaureate students in the elementary education programs.

These students had a grade point average of at least 2.5 and had successfully completed an educational foundations course. Two full-time UTC faculty members were assigned to each school to deliver 15 hours of course work to the students, an additional 3 hours of field experience course credit was supervised by the site coordinator.

The UTC students were expected to be in the schools in the same hours as the public school teachers five days per week. While in the schools they circulated through all grade levels and all and all special areas (art, music, p.e., guidance, etc.). The idea was that the college professors would present the theory and the coordinator would see that the students saw the theory in action and actually got to aid in its implementation. The amount of redundancy in the college courses was reduced because the courses were planned by all of the professors together. In fact, the boundaries between the courses tended to disappear. After the first semester a special education professor was added to one site.

The K-12 students loved the additional attention, while the K-12 teachers appreciated the additional opportunities to individualize their instruction. The college faculty appreciated the chance to work together and to have charges of relevancy virtually eliminated and the UTC students got a very real look at schools. Some decided they needed to change the grade level they wished to teach and a few even decided they should seek some other line of work.

Year II of the PDS I model was a continuation of the second semester expansion of the Year I program which added the Special Education Methods course - title at both sites during the

second semester which necessitated the addition of one university professor with a specialty in the area of Special Education at one site. During the second year a third university faculty was added to the second site to more evenly divide the areas of responsibility, this provided 3 faculty members at each PDS I site.

In the third year one additional special education professor was added to the instructional team at one site and two secondary education professors were added to the other site. UTC special education students and secondary education students were added to the elementary majors at the appropriate sites and the curriculum offerings were expanded accordingly. The establishment and successful operation of these professional development schools (PDS I) began to answer some of the concerns: students would view schools more realistically and be less apt to quit; theory-practice gap was narrowed and courses were less redundant.

Attention was then turned to the student teaching semester. Student teachers were placed in cohort groups in six schools. Schools agreed to take up to 16 student teachers. Each student teacher was assigned to a team of K-12 teachers who were responsible for evaluating and mentoring their student teacher(s). The UTC student teacher would spend 3-4 weeks with one teacher, but would have experience with every team member. There would be no college supervisor. Instead each school would be assigned a "Professor-In-Residence," one of the full time UTC faculty members who would trouble-shoot the program, provide consultative service to the school and coordinate the student teaching experiences. The Professor-In-Residence and the K-12 faculty jointly plan and implement a series of seminars for the student teachers.

The K-12 faculty used a modified version of the Tennessee State Evaluation format currently being implemented with all Tennessee teachers scheduled for evaluation. The Professor-In-Residence worked with the school administrators and assisted the K-12 faculty in using the new evaluation criteria. Instead of paying each cooperating teacher, each school received a lump sum payment to be used as the school faculty wished.

As a result, the student teachers gained support from each other. They observed and worked with a greater range of grade levels and personally experienced much more diverse

teaching practices. The K-12 faculty worked together more and had much more input into teacher training and have become more adept in the evaluation practices that effect them. The whole school program has become the training ground for the budding teachers.

The school-university connection has become much closer and more relevant to both parties. The position of Director of Student teaching has been eliminated. The placement of student teachers has become clerical and the problems of the student teachers are handled by the Professor-In-Residence with occasional over sight by the University Education Department Head. The student teaching sites have become known as Professional Development Schools II, (PDS II).

The concern about middle school teachers' disciplinary preparedness has necessitated a major curriculum change and the development of a separate middle school certification track. This new program contains a strong PDS I component at the middle school level.

The creation of PDS I and PDS II has helped UTC answer many concerns and has strengthened our teacher preparation program. The foregoing is a general overview of what has occurred. The remaining papers will provide the specifics.

The Action: Procedures, Outcomes and Futures

Kathleen Puckett, Special Education Professor at PDS
Doug Kingdon, Elementary Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence
Karla Riddle, PDS Site Coordinator, Hamilton County Public Schools
Barbara Wofford, Elementary Education Professor at PDS

Part I: Procedures

Procedures for implementing the PDS I program have evolved over the course of four years. Table 1 contains the sample invitation form students are given when they are invited to participate in the PDS program.

Table 1
Sample Invitation Form

Initial Invitation to Participate in Professional Development School Experience

What: A field-based education methods program utilizing the following courses:

EDUC	306	Designing Instruction & Evaluation in the Elementary Classroom (3)
	323	Teaching Reading in the Elementary School (1)
	411	Teaching Social Studies in the Elementary and Middle School (1)
	412	Teaching Science in the Elementary & Middle school (1)
	414	Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary & Middle School
	498	A PDS field-based independent study (3)
	*332	Exceptional Students in the Elementary School (3)
USTU	440	Social Studies Topics, Concepts and Perspectives (3)

When: Spring Semester, 1999
Students must be at the assigned school as follows:
a. Monday through Friday
b. 8:00 am to 4:00 pm

Who: The "Chosen Few" (25 maximum for each of two school sites) must:
a. have a minimum GPA of 2.5
b. have completed EDUC 201, Education in the United States (3)
c. have registered in the Education Information Center Office

Where: Twenty-First Century Preparatory School

Why:
a. Methods courses will be taught in conjunction with real students.
b. Recommendations will be received from active practitioners.
c. Employability will be improved.

How: Interested students who meet all of the above criteria should register in the Education Information center, 203 Hunter Hall. You will be notified of your acceptance by telephone prior to registration time. You will need to register for these courses yourself, at registration time

University Faculty visit each section of the Introduction to Education Course (EDUC 201) to inform all education majors of an opportunity to participate in a new field experience

program. Following the presentations, each major is given a written description of the PDS program and an invitation to participate. The respondents who meet all conditions and apply for the PDS experience become PDS cohorts. Depending on their major, (Pre-K-4, Middle Grades, Secondary, or Exceptional Learning), the students are assigned to an appropriate PDS site. An initial organizational meeting the first day of class is held on the university campus with all PDS students meeting as a whole to receive an overview, common expectations, goals, and objectives of the PDS semester. They are introduced to course requirements and site school expectations: schedules, dress codes, professional behavior and confidentiality. Eighteen semester hours of university class work is taught at the PDS sites, in addition, the PDS students offer structured assistance to teachers in classrooms five days a week. The PDS student is immersed in the schedule of the school.

Once they report to the PDS school, the students' first encounter with the realities of the program are with the on-site coordinator, who is one of the site school's regular teachers. The coordinator serves as the liaison between the College of Education, the university professors, PDS students, site school staff, principals and district administration. This position was initially financed with seed money from the University and is maintained as a faculty position funded in part by the university and part by the county schools. The on-site coordinator is responsible for facilitating the PDS experience: matching students with teams of cooperating teachers for field placements, problem solving special situations, and explaining the school curriculum and procedures. The coordinator also supervises the PDS structured assistance. Table 2 lists the activities which PDS students are required to perform while assisting in classrooms.

Table 2
Structured Assistance Assignments

1. Classroom observations: Observe and write reflections on classroom examples of:
   a. Classroom management
   b. Covey's 7 habits
   c. Multiple Intelligences
   d. Traditional and authentic assessment

2.	Teach either small or whole group lessons in Math Science Social Studies
3.	Instructional Games
4.	Learning Center based on Bloom's Taxonomy
5.	Integrated Thematic Unit
6.	Software reviews
7.	Internet Sources and Websites
8.	Professional Growth Portfolios; Team meetings, staff workshops, carnivals, PTA, M-teams, etc.
9.	Journal Articles
10.	Interviews with teachers
11.	Develop examples of instructional strategies: Graphic organizers, etc.
12.	Bulletin Boards
13.	Accelerated Reading

The on-site coordinator also serves as a mentor to the PDS students. The coordinator develops and conducts weekly seminars with PDS students, provides time to question and further explore educational issues and concerns, and addresses any issues of concern. These seminars give students the opportunity to clarify concepts and procedures which they do not understand. As an outgrowth of these weekly seminars, the coordinator's role has evolved into a team teaching experience with the university professors, further strengthening the connection between theory and philosophy and classroom practice.

The University faculty restructured the 18 semester hours of course work into a series of thematic, interdisciplinary modules appropriate for pre-K-4, middle school, secondary and special education pre-service teachers. During the planning phase, the faculty, referring to their traditional course syllabi, identified topics typically included in their courses and determined areas of duplication, breadth and depth of the content and the approximate amount of time needed for adequate coverage. A schedule was developed which identified topics, which were combined and reconfigured to create integrated instructional modules. These modules were team taught utilizing the expertise of the instructors in lead and support roles.

For example, the topic of assessment is normally addressed in all of the methods, special education, and reading courses. Through team planning of the topic, the instructors (including the site coordinator) identified subtopics, presentation ideas, and resources, thus creating tentative time frames and a sequence of delivery. Six major themes emerged during this process: Creating a learning environment, planning for instruction, the process of learning, developing units, teaching models, and issues and concerns. This thematic, interdisciplinary approach facilitates connections among course concepts as teachers and students explore the content and make classroom applications.

Initially, the PDS students had difficulty conceptualizing this modular approach. They were unsure how to organize their notebooks, how to label their notes and how to attach these to "courses." The faculty facilitated the transition process by eliminating course numbers and titles on daily schedules, by tying assignments to one or more textbook authors rather than course names and numbers. Students were told which topics or modules to study when preparing for a test, and faculty collaborated in both the development and grading of projects. When applicable, the same grade became part of the final grade for two or more "courses." Gradually, students were less concerned about course names and used topic and module labels for identification purposes. An example of the modular schedule is included in the Appendix.

Part II: Outcome

Outcomes of the UTC PDS program can be reported along three dimensions: opinionaire data provided by each of the participating parties, differences in subsequent student performance when they returned to the university campus, and networking and career experiences of the participants.

Opinionaire data was gathered from each of the PDS participants: the University PDS students, UTC PDS faculty, School PDS On-site Coordinators, and School Administrators. There was a total of 30 questions within four areas: (1) Curriculum and Planning for Teaching; (2) Roles; (3) University-PDS Relationships; and (4) Perceptions. Over a three year period, there was little difference in perceptions among the participants, and overall scores revealed high

levels of satisfaction with the program. (Gettys, Puckett, Rutledge, Ray, Kingdon, Stepanske, Taylor, and Wofford, 1997).

Differences in student performance are readily noticed as incidental data by professors who teach methods classes containing a mixture of students who participated in a PDS semester and those who did not. Professors and students who participated in PDS experienced a relationship shift, with methods courses assuming more of the quality of a graduate experience. All participants have a referent experience from which to begin discussions, an advantage that non-PDS students do not have. The differences between PDS students and those who did not participate are even more noticeable and revealing during the student teaching (PDS II) semester. PDS students are ready to begin teaching responsibilities sooner, develop stronger and more coherent lesson plans, and are more confident in their lesson delivery.

. An unanticipated outcome of UTC's PDS program is the advantage afforded in the areas of networking and career experiences. Graduates who have had this experience have developed a network of contacts with those teachers and administrators in whose schools they have worked. Principals who interviewed and hired PDS students are now beginning to request graduates who have participated in the PDS as the first tier of candidates for available positions.

Throughout the development of the PDS experience at UTC, the basic concept has not changed. The goal was and still is to give preservice education majors early exposure to in depth, "real" classroom which will help them determine if they have the skills, desire, and commitment needed to be a first-rate educator. One of the PDS students has referred to this program as a "boot camp" for education majors. Upon completing the PDS semester, students will know whether teaching is for them. Others will be better informed to make intelligent decisions regarding the age/grade level to which they are best suited. In addition, PDS students who still want to be an educator pursue their goal with a passion. They are now in a position to better understand the realities, the pitfalls, the demands, and the joys of teaching, and they can hardly wait to get their own classroom.

Part III: Futures

From its inception the PDS program has been an emerging and ever expanding one. The intent is to make this experience a requirement for ALL preservice students in all education licensure programs.

Recently, the State of Tennessee made major changes in it's certification and licensing requirements. This has necessitated changes in public school sites, course-modular topics, and some deployment of UTC faculty. While this may at first appear to be a step backward, it actually provided an opportunity for reflection, rethinking, readjustment, and fine-tuning of the program. It also provided an opportunity to look toward the future needs of the PDS experience.

The preparation needed for the Pre-K-4 educator with its heavy emphasis on nurturing begins to separate somewhat from the preparation necessary for the middle and upper grade educator, where subject matter content demands greater attention. As a consequence, the modules needed at the separate sites need to be changed, as does the required expertise. This calls for a different mix of UTC staff members as well as new and different public school sites (e.g. pre K-4 calls for a school which has a preschool program; a middle grades site needs grades 5-8 opportunities).

The success of the PDS experience heavily impacts the university campus courses which follow. Therefore, a re-examination and adjustment of the goals and objectives, content, processes, and application levels is necessary. In short, a domino effect takes place creating a major changes in the course work and faculty expectations. This offers an opportunity for the public school and the university to continue to work together in bridging the change in this educational reformation so that there will be a better and more realistic alignment of thinking which will result in a better prepared reflective practitioner.

Ground work and initial induction of the PDS experience has been initiated in the preparation of special education teachers. Currently this is being expanded and both foreign language and inclusion programs are in the planning stage.

The PDS I and PDS II packages serve as a basic framework whereby course work taken at the university in between these two experiences serve as compliments and supporting cast. This coursework, however, is more readily applied to the "real" (vs. theoretical or "remembered") educational world. That is, with the initial PDS experience there is the likelihood that the future course work which focuses on content and process development will be filtered through the mental vision of the real needs of classroom students. The second PDS experience thus serves as a capstone.

The Outgrowth: Expansion and Revision of the University of Tennessee's PDS Program

Barbara Ray, Special Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence
Valerie Rutledge, Secondary English Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence
Jeanette Stepanske, Elementary Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In- Residence

The Professional Development School (PDS) experience for education majors at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga has never been exactly the same two semesters in a row. Nor is the program from one PDS school site to another an exact match. Program modifications reflect shifting conceptions of faculty as the program is re-visioned, as well as new information obtained formally and informally from evaluation. The philosophies of each PDS school and the characteristics affect the specifics of the training of future teachers at each site. This section of the paper will address four principle topics:

a) A changing vision of the mission of the early PDS (PDS I) experience

b) Individual differences among PDS I sites

c) Revision of the student teaching semester to a PDS II

e) Benefits of the current PDS program

A Changing Vision of the Mission of the Early PDS (PDS I) Experience

In the third year of the PDS program, the mission was expanded to include secondary education majors at the K-12 site school and special education majors at the K-5 site school. This change served two principle purposes: it made the PDS experience available to other than elementary (multidisciplinary learning) majors for the first time, and it allowed for co-training of teachers who needed some sense of what teachers in other positions were doing. Students being prepared to be elementary and secondary teachers got the broad picture of the entire K-12 educational development of children, while future general education and special education teachers gained insight into each other's mission and classroom functioning.

This shift proved a professional development activity for university faculty as well as university students. Faculty had to examine what in the training of each of the different populations

was the same, what was different but important for each population to know, and what was different enough to fit elsewhere, outside the joint training experience. University faculty had the further experience of co-teaching with a diverse team reflecting different orientations to the educational experience. Faculty discovered what they had in common, thoughtfully and sometimes emotionally examined differences, and grew in respect for differing expertise. It was an exciting time, with great opportunity for the cognitive dissonance that can be conducive to growth. Faculty were also able to provide a dramatic example for students of the need for and the dynamics of collaboration among teachers. It was sometimes stressful, but almost always an exciting, expanding experience.

Another change at each school site reflected the growing comfort between university and public school faculty and incorporated changes suggested by early evaluation data. Roles of PDS professionals were becoming more permeable and interchangeable. University faculty were moving into the public school classrooms more easily, while public school faculty expanded their involvement in the University classes on site at their school. University faculty could now observe or even co-teach or model a teaching strategy within a regular classroom without being a threat to the teacher or feeling overly vulnerable themselves. Public school faculty were now routinely presenting instruction to the PDS classes related to individual areas of expertise. With these modifications, formal instruction more closely paralleled and expanded the experiences students were having within the public school classrooms.

This was also a year of experimentation in an attempt to work out answers to several questions:

1. Given five days a week on site, when should students be in public school classrooms and when should they be separated out for formal instruction? At one site, faculty experimented with one full day plus one half day of University involvement, while the second site had students in public school classrooms every morning with up to four afternoons of University activity. It may be that the exact schedule is less important than a match to the needs and schedule of the individual school.

2. What are the most useful field-based activities and assignments for an early PDS experience? Students typically enter PDS I as second semester sophomores or as first semester juniors, with limited prior coursework in education. We discovered they had to be gradually and systematically introduced to the tasks of teaching, using observational, reflective, one-on-one/tutorial, and small group activities. As students assist teachers in their classrooms, ideas that are presented in university, on-site classes become realistic and more readily understood. These same ideas can be transformed into lessons and activities which can be presented by the college students and then evaluated in terms of effectiveness and goal achievement.

3. Can formal instruction ever occur within the public school classrooms without disrupting the education of K-12 students? In some cases, with teaming of faculty, this seemed possible. For example, University students might observe a particular kind of lesson (e.g., a cooperative learning lesson) or the learning needs of a particular subgroup of children (e.g. students with learning disabilities) and then reflect on what they learned from their observations immediately afterwards with a second professional in a separate room.

4. To what degree can special education students and elementary education students, or elementary and secondary education students, be co-taught in a professional development school? We experimented with greater and lesser amount of "pull out" of the future special education teachers from the training of the elementary education majors. Our current thinking is that this initial PDS semester may best serve the needs of both sets of students if it's a "full inclusion" experience, with both learning about meeting the needs of all students within the regular classroom. The site training both elementary and secondary teachers also experimented with heavy amounts of joint instruction with some pullout to address those aspects of education that differed for students at elementary versus secondary levels.

Individual Differences Among PDS I Sites

In addition to the experimentation discussed above which occurred at different PDS sites, University faculty and administration discovered that when individual sites took ownership of aspects of the PDS experience, the programs had an appropriateness to the site that could not have been centrally planned. In other words, there was an essential place for site-based management within the PDS program. The added mission of each site (training of secondary teachers or training of special education teachers) further influenced the activities occurring at each school.

Secondary Program: The secondary component of the PDS is a unique program in several ways. Its placement in a K-12 setting provides individuals who are trained to focus primarily on content area the opportunity to see how other education levels organize their curriculum, manage their classrooms, and implement their strategies. As the program has developed, it has undergone continual revision and adaptation. One specific example is the content area methods course required for each secondary major. Offering this class on-site enables students to not only learn about the types of lessons which are taught, but it also allows them to observe different methods classroom teachers may use to present similar lessons. Furthermore, the adaptations which must be made to accommodate not only the differences between classes but even the difference between students within a single class become evident.

An added benefit secondary education majors gain from the PDS semester is the opportunity to work in teams at the middle school level and in content area departments at the high school level. These pre-service teachers become familiar with a school environment and gain invaluable firsthand knowledge about the interaction between faculty, administration, and students which is vital to a successful school. The organization of a secondary school is one which demands that an educator be able to work closely with other individuals. College students who wish to become educators have the chance to become a part of a team or a department and experience the decision-making, the planning, and the implementation which must occur to provide effective instruction for students.

When faced with the prospect of working with living, breathing young people, pre-service educators begin to realize that content area knowledge alone is not enough. Secondary education

majors must also possess a large repertoire of teaching strategies, classroom management techniques, and pedagogical knowledge. The ability to juggle these areas effectively is crucial to any good teacher. The PDS experience also serves to demonstrate to future teachers that teaching is not a solo performance. The collegiality that comes from being an integral part of a school faculty is apparent when a pre-service teacher is in a school and in a classroom daily. As practicing educators cooperate with their colleagues, college students see that it is imperative to share ideas, to participate in scholarly activities, to develop successful strategies, and to collaborate with many different groups. Even the fact that a secondary teacher must think about the impact of a poor grade on a student's chances for graduation or other post-secondary opportunities can be experienced by a pre-service teacher who is working side-by-side with a licensed teacher.

Special Education Program The special education program at the PDS K-5 site offers two characteristics courses (Mild/Moderate and Severe/Multiple Disabilities) and an elementary special education methods course. Special education students were also provided several regular education methods courses (teaching of reading and math) along with the elementary education majors. An attempt was made to integrate the characteristics classes for special education majors with the special education introduction for general education majors and co-teach general education methods with special education methods to the degree that these courses overlapped in content or were relevant to both majors.

The site selected provided a good introduction to the field of special education for several reasons. First, the elementary school was large, allowing students to be introduced to a wide variety of students with disabilities and a continuum of special education services: inclusion. resource, self-contained classroom, and speech and language therapy. Second, the school had four special education teachers as well as a half-time speech and language pathologist, all of whom were willing to work with these college students thus sharing their methods and knowledge related to students with disabilities. Students were able to experience three different styles for provision of support to students with special needs within the regular classroom: co-teaching, small group instruction within the regular classroom, and monitoring and offering of additional individual instruction. Third,

students experienced inclusion from both the view of the regular educator as well as the special educator, since they were assigned to regular education teachers as well as special education teachers during their two week rotations.

Special education majors got a true feeling for the necessary connection with general education. Most of the teaching of college courses was done by a team of regular and special education faculty, and most of the curriculum and assignments were shared with elementary education majors. We are learning that a strength of the PDS joint training program is that these future special educators have a much stronger foundation in general education curriculum and instruction.

Revision of the Student Teaching Semester to a PDS II

The success of the early PDS semester, along with recognition of the benefit to both university students and faculty when a cohort of students are assigned to the same school and the university professor is able to spend considerable time on site, contributed to the decision to adapt the student teaching semester to a PDS model. In addition, a number of local schools had expressed an interest in the close, interactive relationship with the University that Professional Development School status entailed, and local public school administration was in support of expansion of the program.

The reconfiguration of the student teaching semester with the advent of the PDS II has changed the load of responsibility and created a shared investment in each pre-service teacher's training. The new model resembles an equilateral triangle with the university professor-in-residence, the practicing K-12 educator, and the student teacher anchoring this figure. The student teacher becomes a part of the entire program of a school as he/she moves throughout the different levels of the school and learns about every aspect, from guidance to special education to administration. This allows the prospective educator to gain valuable information about the inner workings of a school, about the interrelationships between faculty, students, administration, and support staff. This experience also affords the student teacher a chance to work with several teachers at one site to learn

about a variety of teaching strategies, classroom management philosophies, and professional development approaches.

The practicing educator assumes a more important role than in earlier student teaching models. Primary responsibility for mentoring, assisting, and evaluating the student teacher lies with the individual formerly placed in the role of cooperating teacher. Years of teaching experience have given the classroom teacher a unique and up-to-date perspective of the students in a school, and allowing the teacher to evaluate the pre-service teacher and provide feedback on his/her performance moves the relationship between these individuals to a new realm. Advice on improvement and new strategies can be gained from the person who will actually conduct the evaluation. Another major improvement in the student teaching program is the use of the new Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth. This instrument offers several advantages over those formerly in place. The Framework is the instrument used to evaluate practicing educators in Tennessee's public schools. In addition, the opportunity to become more familiar with the instrument and the process enables the classroom teacher to use this information to improve his/her own evaluation scores. Furthermore, this is the instrument by which a new teacher will be evaluated once he/she is hired to teach in a Tennessee public school. The practical and professional benefits are extensive.

Yet another role has been developed for the university professor in this new student teaching design. Instead of the former model, which required the university supervisor to visit a student teacher three times during each placement, observe a lesson, and provide feedback, the university person's connection is changed and that individual has become a professor-in-residence. This new position involves visiting the school at least once weekly for the equivalent of one day or more, offering professional assistance to the faculty and administration of the school, organizing relevant seminars for the student teachers at the site, and working with other projects identified by the school faculty.

PDS II, as it has come to be called, is thus a student teaching experience with several characteristics which distinguishes it from previous arrangements:

- A sizable cohort of students are assigned to the same school.

- A university faculty member, known as the "Professor-In-Residence," spends the equivalent of one day a week at the school.
- Regular student teaching seminars are offered on site and are often taught or attended by classroom teachers.
- The public school faculty "adopt" the cohort. They take responsibility for mentoring and evaluating each student teacher. Each student teacher is observed by several professionals, resulting in a minimum of three written observations per eight week period. The observers then meet as a team to complete the written evaluation of the student teacher.
- Barriers between classrooms are eased. Student teachers can follow students to special classes, observe other same-grade classes, do some teaching in the grade above or below the one to which they are assigned. Schedules are typically determined by a team which includes the student teacher. If a student teacher has a particular need (e.g. to observe multiple classroom management styles), this can be arranged with his or her cooperating teacher and school administrator.

Benefits of the Current PDS Program Experience

The PDS I experience at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga comes early in the student's preparation for the career of teaching. One of the most crucial factors in helping an individual determine whether he or she is suited for the education profession is afforded through daily contact with children and young people. In some instances, prospective teachers discover that a different grade level than the one to which they were initially attracted is actually more appealing. Moreover, in the most extreme situations, individuals may even discover that education is not the profession for which they are destined. Even this outcome has its positive side, because the PDS I experience occurs at a point in the student's career which allows for a change in major while time still remains to do so efficiently and with less disruption or extension of time than if such a discovery had been made during the student teaching semester.

Increasingly, universities and school systems are discovering that future educators trained in the field are better prepared, more aware of the realities of the profession, and more capable of coping with the situations they may encounter early in their careers. The competency gained by a secondary major who has worked with teenagers in an academic setting or the special education major who has seen inclusion from both the perspective of the general educator and the special educator in an elementary school is superior to the book knowledge obtained by those same individuals if they have only read about these topics.

Significant benefits can already be seen in those pre-service educators who have been trained in the PDS I setting versus those who have been trained primarily in the college class. PDS I students tend to exhibit a higher level of competency early in their student teaching semester. They are able to draw upon firsthand knowledge and activities which were gained at the side of a practicing professional before they assumed the responsibility for instructing the class on their own.

The PDS II semester provides the support system of a cohort of pre-service teachers who are placed at a school site and remain together throughout their student teaching placement. A relationship develops between members of the cohort and their professor-in-residence and they are able to share concerns, discuss issues, and investigate questions which are relevant to all those pre-service teachers placed at that site.

Another benefit which has resulted from the PDS partnership between the University and local schools has been the increased level of communication. The presence of university professors on the K-5 or K-12 campus creates an open atmosphere for discussion not only of students, but also of programs, ideas, and theories. The differences between the climate and the culture of the K-12 schools and the university are diminished when people involved with each are able to exchange professional information and discuss education issues on a regular basis.

The Evaluation: A Connection to the Tennessee Framework for Teachers

Cynthia Gettys, Elementary Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence
Daniel Baker, Secondary Education, Professor-In-Residence
Caryl Taylor, Special Education Professor at PDS, Professor-In-Residence

As part of the professional development school student teaching experience, a component has been added which directly ties the student teaching experience to the world of the K-12 practitioner. The State of Tennessee has adopted the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium's (INTASC) standards as the model by which teacher education institutions should be examined for program approval and by which K-12 educators would be evaluated. A seamless link has thus been created which permits the establishment of a continuum between the procedures used to evaluate and provide support to student teachers and the procedures first year teachers will encounter in the Comprehensive Assessment phase of the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth, the official evaluation procedure adopted by public schools throughout Tennessee.

The evaluations in student teaching utilizing the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth and the observations of other educators comprise important learning experiences and opportunities for reflection for student teachers and also prepare them for the formal observations which come when they begin their teaching careers. The following paper gives a description of the processes and procedures of the evaluation.

A minimum of two observations per eight week placement are completed utilizing observation and conference forms which are relatively open-ended. Sections which refer to the quality of the lesson plan, general observations and areas of strength and those requiring improvement are completed by the observer. Prior to teaching these two lessons using the procedures in the Framework, the student teacher provides the teacher with a lesson plan which uses a checklist from the Framework as a guide. Please see the appendix for copies of all of the observation forms referred to in this paper.

The sequence for the formal observation using the Framework is as follows. Prior to the teaching the lesson the student teacher prepares a lesson plan. The student teacher also prepares the Planning Information Record (PIR). This record consists of a series of questions teachers should consider in anticipation of their lessons. The student teacher and the cooperating teacher/observer should meet briefly for clarification purposes to review the lesson plan and the PIR. The observer should, at some time, review the lesson plan, provide feedback using the appropriate checklist and return the plan to the student teacher during the reflecting conference.

As the student teacher teaches the lesson the observer records enough data to allow a thorough review of the lesson. The observer may script the entire lesson or modify this process to record less verbatim dialogue but more anecdotal information about the students and classroom.

. After the lesson is taught the student teacher and the observer spend time, on their own, evaluating the lesson. The student teacher examines whether the goals and objectives were met, whether the plan was followed and if not, why not, and completes the Reflecting Information Record (RIR). The observer spends some time analyzing the lesson so that he or she can effectively guide the student teacher through a post-observation (reflecting) conference. During this conference the observer uses the questions on the RIR as a guide but should also consider other questions which should be asked and which require the student teacher to be analytical about the lesson. It is important that the observer develop a plan and sequence for the conference which requires the student teacher to be analytical and does not place the student teacher in a passive role listening to a report about his or her teaching performance.

When the Reflecting Conference is concluded the observer completes those portions of the Student Teaching Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth Report which apply to the lesson. This form is comprised of six domains with several indicators referring to each. The student teachers performance is rated as unsatisfactory, Performance Level A or Performance Level B. Rubrics and Indicator Descriptors are provided to observers to help them with this form. In order to complete the process effectively, observers need to understand the Indicators

and Measurement Statements fully. Several of the indicators, such as those referring to communications with parents cannot be completed from the observation of the lesson. These indicators are completed from information gathered by the cooperating teachers throughout the duration of the student teaching placement. The form is completed in its entirety by a team of evaluators at the end of the placement and is retained by the student teacher. It is important that a minimum of two teachers observe lessons taught by the student teacher. This may be accomplished as the student teachers teaches in more than one classroom and/or by having additional teachers observe the student teacher in a single classroom.

A mid-term **progress report** is also part of the evaluation process. This report assumes that cooperating teachers and student teachers are familiar with the measurement statements contained in the Framework and have discussed them. The report indicates that conversations have occurred and that these statements have provided a focus from which to judge the student teachers' performance. The mid-term report is not intended to be evaluative but should provide the basis for dialogue about competencies which the student teacher is expected to demonstrate during PDS II, the student teaching semester.

The **Final Evaluation Form** has the same format as the mid-term progress report except that the student teacher must be rated on a scale of 1 -4. The summary recording instructions on the form provide consistency between the ratings on the Final Evaluation Form and the Performance Level Ratings on the Student Teaching: Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth Report. The Final Evaluation Form is also completed together by the team of teachers who had an opportunity to observe and work with the student teacher. The ratings are shared with the student teachers. This form constitutes the official evaluation for the student teaching experience and is returned to the university for the files.

A final component of each eight week student teaching experience is the completion of a self-assessment by the student teachers. Using the Domains and Indicators from the Framework, the student teachers evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. At the conclusion of the first eight-week placement this form is forwarded to the next set of teachers with whom the student

teachers will work. Thus, the self-assessment serves as a guide from which experiences can be provided to assure maximum growth in areas identified by the student teacher in consultation with their cooperating teachers. At the conclusion of the student teaching semester a second self-assessment requires the student teachers to critically reassess their strengths and weaknesses. Depending on the culminating experiences developed at each student teaching site, student teachers may be requested to anticipate professional growth experiences in which they would participate in the event that they are offered jobs in local area schools.

Observing other teachers also comprises an important component of the student teaching semester. Simply sitting in a classroom as a teacher teaches does not, however, always lead to insight if the observer does not understand which teaching behaviors should be observed. In a perfect situation student teachers could be sent to various classrooms to observe specific aspects of veteran teachers' performances. However, since teachers in most buildings have been relatively isolated and have not been provided with opportunities to observe their peers, they may not know the strengths of other teachers. Given this dilemma, we suggest that the student teachers use the measurement statements from the Framework as a perspective from which to view teaching. Thus, if a teacher has a reputation as an effective classroom manager the student teacher could use the measurement statements as a lens through which to observe the classroom. It is important that the student teachers and the teachers they observe have opportunities to talk about the lessons observed after the visits. This dialogue could also include other teachers, administrators and student teachers and could eventually lead to a series of professional seminars in which best practice and the trials and tribulations of teaching are discussed.

The professional development school model has afforded UTC student teachers significant advantages over traditional student teaching arrangements. Notably, the evaluation component is shared by several teachers and/or administrators; the people who see the student teachers work on a daily basis. Additionally, the student teachers are provided with opportunities to seminar with departments or grade levels regarding their performance. Finally, the use of the state model for evaluation will make a significant impact on the student teachers'

preparedness to complete the process during their first year of teaching and should increase their potential in the job market since administrators will recognize their familiarity with both the evaluative and professional growth components of the system.

References

Berg, M., & Murphy, D. (1993). Through the looking glass: Linking theory and practice in teacher preparation. *Contemporary Education*, 64 (4), 252-254.

Black A. & Ammon, P. (1992). A developmental-constructivist approach to teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 43(5). 323-335

Brooks, J. G. & Brooks, M.G. (1993). *The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Brown, J.S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*. 18(1). 32-42.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986) *A nation prepared: Teachers for the twenty-first century*. New York.

Colblurn, Alan. (1993). *Creating Professional development schools*. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation Fastback, #352, Bloomington, Indiana.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Developing professional development schools: Early lessons, challenge and promise. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.) *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession* (p. 21). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. (1996). What Matters Most. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78 (2). 193-200.

Denzin, N.K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications

Dixon, P. & Ishler, R. (1992). Professional development schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43 (1), 28-34.

Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Fullan, M.G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Harper Collins.

Gettys, C.M. & Ray, B.M. (1996). *An Analysis of Initial Perception of the Professional Development School Experience*. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Association, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, November 8, 1996. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) System. ED405299. SP037176.

Gettys, C.M., Puckett, K.S., Rutledge, V.C., Ray, B.M., Kingdon, D, Stepanske, J., Taylor, C., Wofford, B.A., Black, J., Riddle, K. (1997). *The Professional Development School (PDS) Experience: The Beginning of a Longitudinal Study*. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Association, Memphis, Tennessee, November 13, 1997.

Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.*. New York: Longman.

Glickman, C. (1990). *Supervison of instruction.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Irvin, G. (1990). Collaborative teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan* 71 (7) 622-24.
Million, S. K. & Vare, J. W. The Collaborative School: A Proposal for Authentic Partnership In a Professional Development School. *Phi Delta Kappan* 78 (9) 710-713.

Keating, P.J. & Clark, R.W. (1988). Accent on leadership: The Puget Sound Educational Consortium. In K. Sirotnik & J. Goodlad (eds.), *School - university partnerships in action* (pp. 148-166), New York: Teachers College Press.

Lesar, S. Benner, S.M., Habel, J. & Coleman, L. (1997). *Preparing General Education Teachers for Inclusive Settings: A Constructivist Teacher Education Program..* Teacher Education and Special Education 20 (3) 204-220.

Lieberman, A. (1988). The Metropolitan School Study Council: A living history. In K. Sironik & J. Goodlad (eds.), *School - university partnerships in action* (pp. 69-85), New York: Teachers College Press.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Nowacek, E.J. & Blanton, L.P. (1996). A Pilot Project Investigating the Influence of a Collaborative Methods Course on Pre-service Elementary Education Teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education.* 19 (4), 298-312.

O'Neil, J. (1992, March). Wanted: Deep understanding. *ASCD Update*, **3 4**(3), 1,4-5,8.

Sid W. Richardson Foundation. (1993). T*he professional development school: A commonsense approach to improving education.* Fort Worth, TX: Author.

Sirotnik, K.A., and Goodlad, J.I. (1988). Research on professional development schools. In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, edited by W.R. Houston. New York: Macmillan.

Stallings, J.A. (1991). *Connecting Pre-Service Teacher Education and Inservice Professional*

Development: A Professional Development School. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago. ED 339682.

Teitel, L. (1994). Can school-university partnerships lead to the simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education? *Journal of Teacher Education.* 45 (4). 245-252.

Teitel, L. (1996). *Professional Development Schools: A Literature Review.* Washington, D.C.: Professional Development School Standards Project, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Wise, Arthur E. (1996). Building a System of Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 78 (3). 191-192.

Appendices

To be completed by student teacher

Comprehensive Assessment

Planning Information Record

EDUCATOR NAME:_____ OBSERVATION NO: _____

EVALUATOR NAME:_____ DATE:_____

Educator completes this form for each formal observation, however the evaluator may need to discuss the contents of this form for clarification purposes. Educators retain the right to make instructional decisions/changes during the observation.

1. What is the student goals(s)/objectives (s) for the lesson? *(What is the ultimate desired outcome of this lesson?)* In the event that students are working on individual objectives, choose 2 or 3 students and provide their objectives. **IA**

2. What information do you have regarding your students' current abilities in relation to this objectives (s) and how has this impacted the design of this lesson? **IB and IC**

3. What teaching strategies will you use to teach this objective? (*What behaviors will you look for to determine whether or not the students are meeting the objectives (s)?* **IE**

4. What are the student indicators of success within this lesson? *(What behaviors will you look for to determine whether or not the students are meeting the objectives (s)?)* **IB**

5. Identify the date which will be collected to evaluate the students' achievements of the goal (s) / objectives (s). **IIIA**

6. What future assessments will you use to determine the retention and ongoing application of today's learning? **IIIA**

7. What is the relationship of this lesson to the larger unit of study and to your annual goals? **IA**

8. Do you have any concerns at this point regarding this lesson or these students?

To be completed by student teacher

Comprehensive Assessment

Reflecting Information Record

EDUCATOR NAME:_____ OBSERVATION NO:_____

EVALUATOR NAME:_____ DATE:_____

Educator completes this form for each formal observation; however the evaluator and the educator are to discuss the contents of this form.

1. As you reflect on the lesson, what are your initial impressions? What did you see your students doing or hear them saying that support your impressions?. **IIIC**

2. In your reflection, how did the lesson actually unfold as compared to what you had anticipated happening as you did your planning? **IIIC**

3. As you reflect on the goals/objectives for the lesson, what can you say about your students' achievement of those goals? *(You may wish to discuss the class as a whole as well as individual student's achievement as appropriate. Include information regarding student performance data which was collected.)* **IIIA and IIID**

4. If you were to teach this lesson again to these students, describe the lesson plan. **IIIC and Domains where changes were made**

5. As you envision the next step for these students in learning, what do you have planned? **IIIC and Planning Domain**

6. As you reflect over this lesson/reflection and previous lessons/reflections (if appropriate), what ideas or insights are you discovering about your teaching? **IIIC**

7. In thinking about future observations and reflection, what are some areas upon which you would like to focus?

To be completed by evaluating team member

Comprehensive Assessment

Appraisal Record

EDUCATOR NAME: **DATE:**

This form to be completed after each planning, observation, reflection cycle. Feedback regarding areas not included in the observation process such as the Educator information Record may be included.

Feedback regarding Performance Standards:

Evaluator/educator comments regarding the educator's evaluation to this point:

Signature indicates that the above information has been shared and discussed.

Educator *Evaluator*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FORMATIVE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION
PRE/POST OBSERVATION CONFERENCE RECORD

STUDENT TEACHER'S NAME_____
OBSERVER'S NAME_____GRADE _____
OBSERVATION NUMBER_____DATE OF OBSERVATION_____

I. PLANNING

a) Topic of focus of lesson:

b) Did this occur:_____yes _____no: if no, what actually happened?

c) Special focuses of observation:

d) Learner objectives (skills, contend objectives, affective objectives)

e) Were objectives congruent with activities as observed:____yes____no; if no, explain.

II. TEACHING STRATEGIES

a) What will teacher be doing during lesson (teacher activities)?

FORMATIVE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION
PRE/POST CONFERENCE RECORD

b) Did teacher activities occur as intended:_____yes_____no; if no, explain.

III. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
How will achievement of objectives be measured? When?

IV. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
a) Special conditions (students, materials, classroom, other) which should be considered (optional):

b) What will students be doing during the lesson (student activities)?

c) Did student activities occur as intended:_____yes____no; if no, explain.

V. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
What professional growth activities does this student feel they would select to attend if they had a choice? Where areas do they feel they need additional training in?

FORMATIVE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION
PRE/POST CONFERENCE RECORD

VI. COMMUNICATION
Quality of oral and written communication.

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATION

Additional comments about lesson, classroom management, student involvement, climate or related areas:

Strengths exhibited during this observation:

Areas of need exhibited during this observation:

Observer's Comments:

Student Teacher's Comments:

Observer's Signature/ Date **Student Teacher's Signature/Date**

Formative Classroom Observation Instrument

Student Teacher's Name _____ **Date of Observation** _____

Observer's Name _____ **Grade Leve**

Observed _____

Framework Area		Notes, Script, Comments
I.	**Planning**	
1.	Establishes long-term goals reflecting a student-centered curriculum.	
2.	Establishes goals and objectives which address student needs at the appropriate level.	
3.	Establishes goals and objectives which address the thinking process.	
4.	Evaluates goal achievement/plans.	
5.	Matches instruction to goals and objectives, strategies, assessments and student needs.	
6.	Provides instruction integrating knowledge, skills, and methods from related subject areas.	
7.	Provides instruction integrating materials, human resources, and technology.	
8.	Understands and identifies different student approaches to learning and performance.	
9.	Meets instructional needs of students from diverse cultures with different learning needs.	
II.	**Teaching Strategies**	
1.	Understands concepts, assumptions, and processes of inquiry central to discipline.	
2.	Varies instructional role re content, purposes of instruction, and student needs.	
3.	Uses multiple explanations of concepts, captures key ideas, links student understanding.	
4.	Paces the lesson appropriately.	
5.	Clarifies directions and explanations when students misunderstand.	
6.	Engages students in active learning to promote critical thinking and problem-solving.	
7.	Helps students assume responsibility for identifying and using varied learning resources.	
8.	Provides practice activities which support the achievement of instructional goals.	
9.	Engages students in generating knowledge.	
10.	Links learning to students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds.	
11.	Elicits examples of student thinking that simulate reflection on own and others' ideas.	
12.	Facilitates internalization of learning and development of employability skills.	
13.	Organizes, prepares, monitors independent and group work allowing for full participation.	
III.	**Assessment and Evaluation**	
1.	Uses assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to learning expectations.	
2.	Uses information from a variety of sources to make instructional decisions.	
3.	Interprets assessment data appropriately and uses it for diagnosis and instruction.	
4.	Organizes and maintains useful records; communicates effectively with parents/students.	
5.	Provides prompt and immediate feedback to students to move them to the next level.	
6.	Uses a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate curriculum and instruction.	
7.	Monitors and modifies teaching strategies in relation to student success.	
8.	Uses student performance data to improve instruction.	
9.	Assesses, analyzes, and communicates accurately the effectiveness of instruction.	
10.	Evaluates student achievement and determines amount of progress.	
11.	Evaluates student attitudes toward learning and determines amount of positive change.	
IV.	**Learning Environment**	
1.	Uses strategies in which students work collaboratively, independently, and purposefully.	
2.	Assists students in developing shared expectations for interactions and responsibilities.	
3.	Establishes and maintains standards of mutually respectful interaction.	
4.	Uses management techniques which foster self-control and self-discipline.	
5.	Communicates and challenges students in a positive, purposeful manner.	
6.	Organizes, allocates, and manages resources to engage students in productive learning.	
7.	Maximizes the amount of class time spent in learning.	
8.	Demonstrates flexibility and modifies procedures as situations demand	

V. Professional Growth

1. Demonstrates productive leadership or team membership skills.
2. Participates in collegial activities to make the school a productive learning environment.
3. Provides evidence of performance levels and articulates strengths and areas for growth.
4. Articulates a professional development plan to improve performance and repertoire.
5. Performs professional responsibilities efficiently:
    - Maintains accurate and up-to-date records.
    - Completes assigned tasks on schedule.
    - Maintains a satisfactory record of punctuality and attendance.
    - Follows applicable policies and procedures.
    - Maintains confidentiality and fulfills legal responsibilities.

VI. Communication

1. Demonstrates an understanding of effective verbal and non-verbal communication.
2. Models effective communication strategies in all interactions with students.
3. Uses appropriate grammar and word choice for clear, concise exchange of information.
4. Writes clearly and effectively:
    - Uses correct grammar.
    - Organizes information logically.
    - Designs communication appropriate to the audience.

PDS II Self-Analysis Lens Using the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth

Introduction:

One of the indicators which poses the most difficulty for teachers is IIIC: Reflects on teaching practice by evaluating continually the effects of instruction. It is not that teachers do not consider what they do each day and ponder whether lessons have gone well, the difficulty lies in that many do not systematically analyze their instruction using criteria derived from principles of best practice.

In order to help you become more accustomed to doing this and provide you information which will facilitate the completion of the mid-term progress report, your task is to analyze a series of lessons which you teach using the criteria from the Framework listed below. You must provide evidence or examples that you have addressed each measurement statement. Use the indicator descriptors to help you understand each measurement statement. ***This assignment is due by November 18 which is also the date on which the mid-term progress report is due.***

Teaching Strategies Domain II:

-Demonstrates an understanding of major concepts, assumptions, debates, processes of inquiry, and ways of knowing that are central to the discipline being taught.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Varies the instructional role in relation to the content and purposes of instruction and the needs of students.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Uses multiple representations and explanations of disciplinary concepts that capture key ideas and links them to students' prior understandings.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Paces the lesson appropriately.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Clarifies directions and explanations when students misunderstand.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Uses appropriately multiple teaching and learning strategies to engage students in active learning opportunities that promote the development of critical and creative thinking, problem solving, and performance capabilities.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Uses strategies which help students assume responsibility for identifying and using varied learning resources.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Provides practice activities which support the achievement of the instructional goals and objectives.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Engages students in generating knowledge.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Links learning with students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Elicits examples of student thinking and stimulates student reflection on their own ideas and those of others.

NA__,Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Facilitates the students' internalization of the learning and the development of employability skills. -

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Organizes, prepares students for, and monitors independent and group work that allows for the full and varied participation of all individuals.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

PDS II Observation Lens Using the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth
Introduction:

As student teachers visit other teachers' classrooms to observe instruction it will be helpful if they have a "lens" which will provide them a focus for their observations. It is suggested that, unless student teachers are sent to visit a teacher for a specific reason, they use the measurement statements listed below from the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth to guide their observations. Observations will be particularly useful if teachers can inform the student teacher/observer to look for particular instructional strategies. Additionally, the observation process will be strengthened if time is made to discuss the results of the observations.

Student teachers and/or cooperating teachers using this form should refer to the indicator descriptors handout for additional explanations of the measurement statements listed below.

Teaching Strategies Domain II:

-Demonstrates an understanding of major concepts, assumptions, debates, processes of inquiry, and ways of knowing that are central to the discipline being taught.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Varies the instructional role in relation to the content and purposes of instruction and the needs of students.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Uses multiple representations and explanations of disciplinary concepts that capture key ideas and links them to students' prior understandings.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Paces the lesson appropriately.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Clarifies directions and explanations when students misunderstand.

NA___ Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Uses appropriately multiple teaching and learning strategies to engage students in active learning opportunities that promote the development of critical and creative thinking, problem solving, and performance capabilities.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Uses strategies which help students assume responsibility for identifying and using varied learning resources.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Provides practice activities which support the achievement of the instructional goals and objectives.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Engages students in generating knowledge.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Links learning with students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Elicits examples of student thinking and stimulates student reflection on their own ideas and those of others.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Facilitates the students' internalization of the learning and the development of employability skills.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Organizes, prepares students for, and monitors independent and group work that allows for the full and varied participation of all individuals.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

Assessment and Evaluation Domain III:

-Uses assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to the learning expectations being evaluated (affective as well as academic).

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Solicits and uses information from a variety of sources about students experiences, learning behaviors, needs, attitudes and progress to make initial and ongoing instructional decisions.*

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Interprets assessment data appropriately and uses this information for diagnosis and instruction.*

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Provides prompt and immediate feedback to students to focus them on what needs to be done to move to the next performance level.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

*May require discussion with the teacher if Evidence/example of these measurement statements is unobservable.

-Monitors the teaching strategies and behavior in relation to student success, modifying plans and instructional approaches accordingly.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

Learning Environment Domain IV:

-Uses a range of strategies to create a learning community where students are encouraged to assume responsibility for themselves and others at a level commensurate with their abilities, work collaboratively and independently, and engage in purposeful learning activities.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Assists the students in developing shared expectations for student interactions, academic discussions, and individual and group responsibilities.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Establishes and maintains standards of mutually respectful interaction within the classroom.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Uses classroom management techniques that foster self-control and self-discipline.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Communicates with and challenges students in a positive, purposeful manner.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, facilities, activities, instructional assistants and volunteers and attention in order to provide active and equitable engagement of students in productive learning.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Maximizes the amount of time spent in learning by creating expectations and processes for communication and behavior.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Demonstrates flexibility and modifies classroom procedures and instructional procedures as the situation demands.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

Assessment and Evaluation Domain V:

-Uses assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to the learning expectations being evaluated (affective as well as academic).

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Solicits and uses information from a variety of sources about students experiences, learning behaviors, needs, attitudes and progress to make initial and ongoing instructional decisions.*

NA___ Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Interprets assessment data appropriately and uses this information for diagnosis and instruction.*

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

*May require discussion with the teacher if Evidence/example of these measurement statements is unobservable.

-Provides prompt and immediate feedback to students to focus them on what needs to be done to move to the next performance level.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Monitors the teaching strategies and behavior in relation to student success, modifying plans and instructional approaches accordingly.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

Learning Environment Domain VI:

-Uses a range of strategies to create a learning community where students are encouraged to assume responsibility for themselves and others at a level commensurate with their abilities, work collaboratively and independently, and engage in purposeful learning activities.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Assists the students in developing shared expectations for student interactions, academic discussions, and individual and group responsibilities.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Establishes and maintains standards of mutually respectful interaction within the classroom.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Uses classroom management techniques that foster self-control and self-discipline.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Communicates with and challenges students in a positive, purposeful manner.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, facilities, activities, instructional assistants and volunteers and attention in order to provide active and equitable engagement of students in productive learning.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Maximizes the amount of time spent in learning by creating expectations and processes for communication and behavior.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

-Demonstrates flexibility and modifies classroom procedures and instructional procedures as the situation demands.

NA___Evidence/example that this area is addressed:_____

_____

_____

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
College of Education and Applied Professional Studies

Student Teaching Progress Report

STUDENT TEACHER (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)		SOCIAL SECURITY #	DATE
SCHOOL		CITY, STATE	
GRADE LEVEL(S)	SUBJECT(S)	UTC PROFESSOR-IN-RESIDENCE	

DIRECTIONS: At approximately the mid-point of the student teacher's experience, and after the student teacher has had opportunities to teach, he or she should be provided feedback about strengths and weaknesses. The purpose of this form is to indicate which of the following measurement statements have been evaluated for the student teacher. Some conclusions may be drawn directly from observations of teaching; others will relate to more general experiences and abilities (such as communication skills). Please mark the first box if the measurement statement has been evaluated and discussed. If the performance standard was not observed and the student teacher has not received feedback, please indicate NA. This completed form should be retained by the UTC professor-in-residence.

AREA	CHECK	NA
Planning		
1. Establishes long-term goals reflecting a student-centered curriculum.		
2. Establishes goals and objectives which address student needs at the appropriate level.		
3. Establishes goals and objectives which address the thinking process.		
4. Evaluates goal achievement/plans.		
5. Matches instruction to goals and objectives, strategies, assessments and student needs.		
6. Provides instruction integrating knowledge, skills, and methods from related subject areas.		
7. Provides instruction integrating materials, human resources, and technology.		
8. Understands and identifies different student approaches to learning and performance.		
9. Meets instructional needs of students from diverse cultures with different learning needs.		
Teaching Strategies		
1. Understands concepts, assumptions, and processes of inquiry central to discipline.		
2. Varies instructional role re content, purposes of instruction, and student needs.		
3. Uses multiple explanations of concepts, captures key ideas, links student understanding.		
4. Paces the lesson appropriately.		
5. Clarifies directions and explanations when students misunderstand.		
6. Engages students in active learning to promote critical thinking and problem-solving.		
7. Helps students assume responsibility for identifying and using varied learning resources.		
8. Provides practice activities which support the achievement of instructional goals.		
9. Engages students in generating knowledge.		
10. Links learning to students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds.		
11. Elicits examples of student thinking that simulate reflection on own and others' ideas.		
12. Facilitates internalization of learning and development of employability skills.		
13. Organizes, prepares, monitors independent and group work allowing for full participation.		

Student Teaching Progress Report

AREA	CHECK	NA
Assessment and Evaluation		
1. Uses assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to learning expectations.		
2. Uses information from a variety of sources to make instructional decisions.		
3. Interprets assessment data appropriately and uses it for diagnosis and instruction.		
4. Organizes and maintains useful records; communicates effectively with parents/students.		
5. Provides prompt and immediate feedback to students to move them to the next level.		
6. Uses a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate curriculum and instruction.		
7. Monitors and modifies teaching strategies in relation to student success.		
8. Uses student performance data to improve instruction.		
9. Assesses, analyzes, and communicates accurately the effectiveness of instruction.		
10. Evaluates student achievement and determines amount of progress.		
11. Evaluates student attitudes toward learning and determines amount of positive change.		
Learning Environment		
1. Uses strategies in which students work collaboratively, independently, and purposefully.		
2. Assists students in developing shared expectations for interactions and responsibilities.		
3. Establishes and maintains standards of mutually respectful interaction.		
4. Uses management techniques which foster self-control and self-discipline.		
5. Communicates and challenges students in a positive, purposeful manner.		
6. Organizes, allocates, and manages resources to engage students in productive learning.		
7. Maximizes the amount of class time spent in learning.		
8. Demonstrates flexibility and modifies procedures as situations demand.		
Professional Growth		
1. Demonstrates productive leadership or team membership skills.		
2. Participates in collegial activities to make the school a productive learning environment.		
3. Provides evidence of performance levels and articulates strengths and areas for growth.		
4. Articulates a professional development plan to improve performance and repertoire.		
5. Performs professional responsibilities efficiently:		
Maintains accurate and up-to-date records.		
Completes assigned tasks on schedule.		
Maintains a satisfactory record of punctuality and attendance.		
Follows applicable policies and procedures.		
Maintains confidentiality and fulfills legal responsibilities.		
Communication		
1. Demonstrates an understanding of effective verbal and non-verbal communication.		
2. Models effective communication strategies in all interactions with students.		
3. Uses appropriate grammar and word choice for clear, concise exchange of information.		
4. Writes clearly and effectively:		
Uses correct grammar.		
Organizes information logically.		
Designs communication appropriate to the audience.		

Student Teaching Progress Report

Please indicate areas which need to be strengthened.

EVALUATION TEAM SIGNATURES

STUDENT TEACHER'S SIGNATURE DATE

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
College of Education and Applied Professional Studies

Student Teaching Final Evaluation

STUDENT TEACHER (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)		SOCIAL SECURITY #	DATE
SCHOOL		CITY, STATE	
GRADE LEVEL(S)	SUBJECT(S)	UTC PROFESSOR-IN-RESIDENCE	

SUMMARY RECORDING: Mark the proficiency level from the Instructional Development Scale for each area listed. Level 1 or Level 2 should be selected if, according to the guidelines for using the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth, the Area/Measurement Statement would be identified as an area to strengthen. Level 3 should be selected if the student's ability conforms to Rubric Level A and is not designated as an area to strengthen. Level 4 should be selected if the student's ability conforms to Rubric Level B. The descriptors below are drawn from the measurement statements found in the Framework but are slightly abbreviated. For the full statements, consult the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth.

Level 1 = Student teacher has not yet developed or used this skill.
Level 2 = Student teacher is beginning to incorporate this skill in his/her instructional repertoire.
Level 3 = Student teacher uses this skill appropriately and competently.
Level 4 = Student teacher uses this skill consistently with a high degree of competence and confidence.

AREA	1	2	3	4
Planning				
1. Establishes long-term goals reflecting a student-centered curriculum.				
2. Establishes goals and objectives which address student needs at the appropriate level.				
3. Establishes goals and objectives which address the thinking process.				
4. Evaluates goal achievement/plans.				
5. Matches instruction to goals and objectives, strategies, assessments and student needs.				
6. Provides instruction integrating knowledge, skills, and methods from related subject areas.				
7. Provides instruction integrating materials, human resources, and technology.				
8. Understands and identifies different student approaches to learning and performance.				
9. Meets instructional needs of students from diverse cultures with different learning needs.				
Teaching Strategies				
1. Understands concepts, assumptions, and processes of inquiry central to discipline.				
2. Varies instructional role re content, purposes of instruction, and student needs.				
3. Uses multiple explanations of concepts, captures key ideas, links student understanding.				
4. Paces the lesson appropriately.				
5. Clarifies directions and explanations when students misunderstand.				
6. Engages students in active learning to promote critical thinking and problem-solving.				
7. Helps students assume responsibility for identifying and using varied learning resources.				
8. Provides practice activities which support the achievement of instructional goals.				
9. Engages students in generating knowledge.				
10. Links learning to students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds.				
11. Elicits examples of student thinking that simulate reflection on own and others' ideas.				
12. Facilitates internalization of learning and development of employability skills.				
13. Organizes, prepares, monitors independent and group work allowing for full participation.				

Student Teaching Final Evaluation

AREA	1	2	3	4
Assessment and Evaluation				
1. Uses assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to learning expectations.				
2. Uses information from a variety of sources to make instructional decisions.				
3. Interprets assessment data appropriately and uses it for diagnosis and instruction.				
4. Organizes and maintains useful records; communicates effectively with parents/students.				
5. Provides prompt and immediate feedback to students to move them to the next level.				
6. Uses a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate curriculum and instruction.				
7. Monitors and modifies teaching strategies in relation to student success.				
8. Uses student performance data to improve instruction.				
9. Assesses, analyzes, and communicates accurately the effectiveness of instruction.				
10. Evaluates student achievement and determines amount of progress.				
11. Evaluates student attitudes toward learning and determines amount of positive change.				
Learning Environment				
1. Uses strategies in which students work collaboratively, independently, and purposefully.				
2. Assists students in developing shared expectations for interactions and responsibilities.				
3. Establishes and maintains standards of mutually respectful interaction.				
4. Uses management techniques which foster self-control and self-discipline.				
5. Communicates and challenges students in a positive, purposeful manner.				
6. Organizes, allocates, and manages resources to engage students in productive learning.				
7. Maximizes the amount of class time spent in learning.				
8. Demonstrates flexibility and modifies procedures as situations demand.				
Professional Growth				
1. Demonstrates productive leadership or team membership skills.				
2. Participates in collegial activities to make the school a productive learning environment.				
3. Provides evidence of performance levels and articulates strengths and areas for growth.				
4. Articulates a professional development plan to improve performance and repertoire.				
5. Performs professional responsibilities efficiently:				
Maintains accurate and up-to-date records.				
Completes assigned tasks on schedule.				
Maintains a satisfactory record of punctuality and attendance.				
Follows applicable policies and procedures.				
Maintains confidentiality and fulfills legal responsibilities.				
Communication				
1. Demonstrates an understanding of effective verbal and non-verbal communication.				
2. Models effective communication strategies in all interactions with students.				
3. Uses appropriate grammar and word choice for clear, concise exchange of information.				
4. Writes clearly and effectively:				
Uses correct grammar.				
Organizes information logically.				
Designs communication appropriate to the audience.				

Student Teaching Final Evaluation

COMMENTS (Include a brief description of the classroom setting and a review of the student teacher's strengths, contributions, and professional potential.)

Signature, Evaluating Team Member or Administrator	Date	Signature, Evaluating Team Member or Administrator	Date
Signature, Evaluating Team Member	Date	Signature, Evaluating Team Member	Date
Signature, Student Teacher	Date	Checked by Head, Teacher Preparation Academy	Date

To Be Completed by the Student Teacher

I request that this evaluation become a part of my record.

Signature _____ Date _____

I hereby grant permission to the College of Education and Applied Professional Studies and The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga to extend to prospective employers the content of this evaluation.

Signature _____ Date _____